REMARKS

Claims 1-27 are currently pending in this application. Independent claims 1, 9, 18, and 25 are amended to clarify the invention. No new matter is included. Reconsideration and allowance of all of the rejected claims are respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

DRAWINGS

Applicants thank the Examiner for approving the change to Figure 1, which is now labeled as prior art.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6, 125, 388 to Reisman ("Reisman"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the following basis.

Independent claims 1, 9, 18, and 27 are amended to recite, among other things, that the plurality of individual messaging accounts are determined based on information associated with the user. In an exemplary embodiment, an integrated view into all of the user's available email accounts are illustrated, regardless of server provider or location (see the specification, the last paragraph on page 5 that bridges onto page 6). In a further embodiment, the proxy server transmits, to each mail server, user account name information that is particular to the *user's individual account* (see the specification at page 6, lines20-25).

In contrast, Reisman is directed to a system for automating the mass distribution of updates, such as current issues, from a remote server to a wide user base having a diversity of computer stations (see Reisman, the Abstract). To this end, Reisman

discloses distributing information based on program information resident in client

computers, rather than based on information associated with the user. More

particularly, Reisman discloses customizing information transport software modules

residing in an individual information product to provide a user interface in the

information product for activating the automated transport of an information object

between a remote object source and a user's computer station (see Reisman, col. 5,

lines 5-10). In view of the foregoing differences, Applicants respectfully submit that

Reisman is deficient because it fails to access the plurality of messaging accounts

based on information associated with the user.

For at least the above reasons, Applicants submit that independent claims 1, 9,

18 and 25 are distinguished over Reisman. Thus, claims 1, 9, 18 and 25 are believed

to be allowable over Reisman and claims 2-8, 10-17, 19-24, 26 and 27 are believed to

be allowable at least by virtue of their dependency.

If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will

expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the

undersigned at the number provided.

Dated: August 11, 2003   Respectfully submitted,

29315

PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE

Sean L. Ingram
Registration No.: 48, 283
MINTZ, LEVIN, COHN, FERRIS, GLOVSKY AND
POPEO P.C.
12010 Sunset Hills Road, Suite 900
Reston, Virginia 20190
703-464-8169

RES 93472v4